

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed October 22, 2004 claims 1-29 are active in this application, of which claims 1 and 9 are independent. Claims 1 and 9 are amended to remove certain limitations and claims 13-29 are newly added. No new matter has been added. Based on the Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,388,651 issued to Kinoshita, *et al.* (“Kinoshita”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,973,660 to Hashimoto (“Hashimoto”), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,322 to Ikeda *et al* (“Ikeda”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kinoshita is directed to a flat-panel display having a plurality of horizontal pixel lines each formed of display pixels arranged in one line and composed of a first and a second driver groups arranged to divide the pixels into two groups and drive the two groups. A drive circuit board includes a gate-array control section connected to the first and second driver groups by a first and second wiring lines separated electrically. Hashimoto discloses a liquid crystal display including a gray level voltage and a gray level generator.

In order to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

Applicant submits that all the claimed features are not taught or suggested by the references, and moreover, Ikeda actually teaches away from the features of claimed invention.

The Examiner agrees that neither Kinoshita nor Hashimoto teach or suggest simultaneous outputting of a data signal from the first and second image signal, one of which is the left-side of the signal processor and the other of which is on the right-side of the processor. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that Ikeda supplies the missing features of Kinoshita and Hashimoto. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Ikeda teaches simultaneously outputting a first and a second image signal simultaneously and cites col. 11, lines 11-45 and Figs. 1a, 16 and 17b. However, this section does not teach simultaneous outputting of a first and a second image signal being output simultaneously.

Rather, the cited passage of Ikeda (i.e., col. 1, lines 11-45) discloses that the drivers 105-1 and 105-2 are controlled by chip selecting functions denoted as RAS signals 104 and 129, i.e., two different signals (see also Figure 1A items 104 and 129). Specifically, at col. 11, lines 23-27, it states:

“The RAS signal of control signals has a chip selecting function and therefore differs for each liquid crystal driver so that RAS signals 104 and 129 are inputted to the liquid crystal drivers 105-1 and 105-2, respectively.” (Emphasis added)

As this passage states, the chip select function RAS is different for each driver 105-1 and 105-2, and, moreover, this passage says nothing about the simultaneousness of the two different RAS signals which controls the chip selects of drivers 105-1 and 105-2. In fact, this passage confirms that the two signals differ and nowhere is there an indication that these two RAS signals are simultaneous. As a consequence, since these two RAS signals are not simultaneous, the

associated data is also not simultaneous. Furthermore, the timing diagrams of Figs. 7-13 illustrate the relationships of timing for just one of these RAS signals and do not show a relationship among the two different RAS signals. Figure 16 also shows the two drivers 105-1 and 105-2 are controlled independently by RAS signals 104 and 129. Figure 17 offers no insight whatsoever to the simultaneity of data operations, rather, Figure 17 simply shows a driver memory map.

However, the one timing diagram, Fig. 14, that does show a comparison and relationship of the two independent RAS signals (i.e., RAS1 and RAS2), clearly shows that the data for the RAS1 driver and the RAS2 driver are not simultaneous but is, in fact, sequential since the RAS1 and RAS2 signals occur at different times. Therefore, since Ikeda fails to supply the missing features of Kinoshita and Hashimoto, and because Ikeda actually teaches away from the claimed invention, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 9 are allowable.

As to the dependent claims 2-8 and 10-12, Applicant submits that these claims depend from respective allowable independent claims 1 and 9, and accordingly are at least allowable due to this dependency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection over claims 1-12 be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims

Support for newly added claims 13, 14, 22 and 23 may be found at least at page 5, lines 17-21 and Fig 1.

Support for newly added claims 15, 16, 24 and 25 may be found at least at page 5, ll. 17-20 and Fig. 1.

Support for claims 17 and 26 may be found at least at Figs 1 and 2; page 7, lines 21-23
and page 6, lines 6-8.

Support for claims 18 and 27 may be found at least at page 7, lines 21-23.

Support for claim 19 may be found throughout the disclosure.

Support for claims 20 and 28 may be found at least at page 11, lines 4-7.

Support for claim 21 may be found at least at page 8, lines 3-5.

Support for claim 29 may be found at least at page 8, lines 3-5.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and places the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: January 21, 2005
McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:CJG